

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 17-54, 57-67 are pending in the present application. By this Amendment, independent claims 1, 20, 36, 44 and 66 being amended herein. No new matter is added.

TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

Applicant appreciates the telephone interviews conducted with Applicant's representative on September 23, 2004 and September 24, 2004. During the interviews, Applicant's representative asserted that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the applied references. In particular, Applicant argued that Tidwell fails to disclose or suggest a method for creating a wizard, comprising at least: prompting input of process steps and a plurality of potential selections associated with each of the process steps. However, the Examiner was not responsive and stated that the claimed invention is taught by the applied references.

Applicant then argued that Tidwell fails to disclose a plurality of input process steps that are displayed concurrently in the wizard, and each of the plurality of input process steps including a corresponding plurality of potential selections which are displayed in the same displayed wizard. The Examiner was responsive to our assertion and stated that the above recited features appeared to be distinguishable over Tidwell.

However, as the Office Action is under a Final rejection, she suggested that the added features to the independent claims would arguably raise new search and/or request further consideration. Thus, Applicant has filed this Request for Continued Examination (RCE) to have

the amendments to claim 1, 20, 36, 44 and 66 considered in an effort to expedite prosecution and receive a Notice of Allowability.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 17, 19-22, 26-37, 39-44, 47-48, 50-54, and 57-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Tidwell. The article “Task Guides: Instant Wizards on the Web” published in ACM in 1997 (hereinafter “Tidwell”); and claims 3, 18, 23-25, 38, 45, 46 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tidwell and further in view of “Microsoft Computer Dictionary” published in 1997 (hereinafter “Microsoft”). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Tidwell and Microsoft, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest prompting a plurality of input process steps and a plurality of potential selections associated with each of the process steps, the plurality of input process steps being displayed concurrently in the wizard, and each of the plurality of input process steps including a corresponding plurality of potential selections which is displayed in the same displayed wizard (emphasis added), as recited in claims 1, 20, 36, 44, and as similarly recited in claim 66.

Tidwell merely discloses a branching function that allows the user to change the next panel based on choices made by the user. For example, on page 266, first column, Tidwell discloses that users are asked what kind of network they have, for which the next panel then depend on the selection made on the current panel. In this type of branching, users do not see the next panel until they click the “next” button. However, Applicant’s invention discloses a plurality of input process step displayed concurrently and a plurality of potential selection displayed in the same displayed wizard.

Accordingly, Tidwell and Microsoft, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method for creating a wizard, comprising at least: prompting a plurality of input process steps and a plurality of potential selections associated with each of the input process steps, the plurality of input process steps being displayed concurrently in the wizard and each of the plurality of input process steps including a corresponding plurality of potential selections which are displayed in the same displayed wizard, as recited in claims 1, 20, 36, 44 and similarly recited in claim 66.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Tidwell and Microsoft, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious the features recited in independent claims 1, 20, 36, 44 and 66. Claims 2-15, 17-19, 21-35, 37-43, 45-54, 57-65 and 67, which the depend from the independent claims are likewise distinguished over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed, as well as for the additional features they recite. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of each of claims 1-15, 17-54 and 57-67 is respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **David J. Cho, Reg. 48,078** at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

 Reg. 48,078

for John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910

Reston, Virginia 20195

(703) 668-8000

JAC/MJL/DJC:krf